

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe

Vol. I, No. 9

Wednesday, December 18, 1918

Price, 3 Cents

Peace--and the Revolution

THE coming peace conference will only incidentally be a conference to discuss peace; it will largely be a conference to discuss action on the Revolution in Russia and in Germany,—to prevent a general European revolution.

The Conference, whether completely imperialistic, partly imperialistic, or "liberal," will still determine peace terms on the basis of Capitalism and Imperialism. But it is precisely the fact of Capitalism that makes it impossible to really heal the wounds of the war and bring a lasting peace.

War was a method for the solution of the complex problems of Capitalism produced by the epoch of Imperialism: the fettering of production by national frontiers, the necessity of national Capitalism becoming international, the struggle for investment markets and undeveloped territory, the process of one nation increasing its own economic opportunity only by necessarily limiting the economic opportunity of other nations. But these problems are insoluble, under Capitalism, which is a mass of contradictions; and war, instead of solving these old problems, has complicated them and produced new problems of larger scope. War appears to Capitalism as the method of solving its contradictions; the method of the proletariat is necessarily Social Revolution, the overthrow of Capitalism.

The proletariat in Russia and in Germany have resorted to the revolutionary method; the European proletariat generally is preparing to use the revolutionary method.

The one attitude that might avert immediate revolution in Europe is the "liberal" attitude, by the European governments adopting the policy of no annexations and no indemnities. The United States, which requires no annexations and no indemnities (because of its peculiar position and because its peace policy is to maintain the balance of power in Europe: neither an aggrandized Germany nor a destroyed Germany, neither an aggrandized Britain nor a destroyed Britain), is pursuing the "liberal" policy. But the European nations inevitably must press for annexations and indemnities: they have to dangle the tangible "fruits of victory" in the eyes of their people, who have agonized for—what? They must, moreover, promote their own Imperialism as the only means of healing the wounds of the war—on the basis of Capitalism.

And so Great Britain proposes to retain the German colonies, exact a crushing indemnity to cover the cost of the war, and maintain its naval supremacy; France insists upon a still huger indemnity, the annexation of the left bank of the Rhine (indisputably German territory) and perhaps a share of the German colonies and Syria; Belgium insists upon "recovering" former "Belgian territory" now a part of Holland; Italy's imperialistic appetite has already produced a clash with the Jugo-Slavs; while the "smaller nations" are at each other's throats, each acting as if one's own national independence is promoted only by crushing the independence of some other "small nationality."

But to impose a huge indemnity upon Germany means to crush Germany industrially, in which event Germany could not pay the indemnity; to lessen the indemnity and allow Germany to recover means to produce financial and industrial complications in the other nations; and the attempt to straighten out this contradiction will make the "peace-conferences" sweat,—while it will compel the intervention of the revolutionary proletariat.

Moreover, all the measures comprised in annexations and indemnities are of profit to Capitalism alone, to the industrial and financial magnates, to the oppressors of labor. A peace on the basis of Capitalism will heal the wounds of capital, but never of labor; only Social Revolution can heal the agonizing wounds inflicted upon the proletariat by the war.

Great Britain, France and Italy—their Capitalism—are determined upon exacting the final measure of tribute from Germany; but this attitude will undoubtedly accelerate the revolutionary process, convincing the German proletariat that Social Revolution is the

only way out; and the definite completion of the proletarian revolution in Germany might inspire the proletariat of the other nations to act, might even eventuate in a new revolutionary war; and in this crisis, the proletariat of France and Italy, perhaps of Great Britain, would prove a natural ally of the Russian and German proletariat—and the general European revolution flare up into action. And if Great Britain, France and Italy relinquish annexations and indemnities, then their financial problems will become disastrously heavy, they will have to impose immediately new burdens upon the proletariat, the mockery of the war will taunt the proletariat and action toward revolution develop.

Real reconstruction can proceed only on a Socialist basis. Precisely as capital used the opportunity of war to enrich itself and oppress labor, so capital will use the opportunity of reconstruction to enrich itself and oppress labor. Moreover, to really reconstruct, it is necessary that there be a release of the giant forces of production; but capital cannot allow this: it will limit reconstruction within the bounds of production for profit. Under Capitalism, reconstruction must first consider the profits of capital, and then the needs of the people. State control of reconstruction will not help, since the state is the state of the bourgeois masters. At its worst, Capitalism will use reconstruction to sweat blood out of the proletariat; at its best, Capitalism tries to potter with "liberal" proposals of reconstruction, but is aghast at the giant problems, wrecked on the rock of class necessity.

The peace conference cannot solve these problems; and as it reveals the ineptitude of the representatives of Capitalism ("liberal" and "conservative") and proposes action against the Revolution, the European proletariat will swell the chorus: Peace with revolution!

Imperialism, which is the final stage of Capitalism and a desperate, futile attempt to solve the multiplying contradictions of Capitalism, has objectively introduced the social-revolutionary epoch; and this social-revolutionary epoch has been subjectively introduced by the proletarian revolution in Russia and Germany. . . .

Peace with revolution—that was the slogan of the Bolsheviks in Russia, that is now the slogan of the German Bolsheviks, that is the slogan of the developing forces of revolutionary Socialism in all European nations.

Peace with revolution—and it is the task of the American proletariat to prevent interference in the revolutionary determination of Europe's destiny.

We learn from the newspapers that "German spies fail to convince Negroes." As a matter of fact it seems to us that they failed to convince anybody of anything, except, of course, the newspapers whom they convinced that all German spies were Socialists, and the Department of Justice, whom they convinced that the best way to stop German espionage was to jail all the Socialists and leave the spies alone.

Congress has appointed a committee to investigate the National Security League. If the result of the investigation turns out to be half as bad as the result of the National Security League's investigation of Congress, somebody is bound to go to jail.

No Answer Yet!

Asserting that United States troops were fighting the Russians without any declaration of war, Senator Hiram Johnson, Republican, introduced a resolution in the Senate, December 12, calling for an investigation in the Russian situation and asking data from the State Department. Senator Johnson asked the following questions, all of which are true:

"Is it true that the Soviet Government offered to the American Government a basis of co-operation, economic and military and sought the help of the American Government to prevent the ratification of the shameful treaty of Brest, and that the American Government never replied to this offer?"

"Is it true that the Russian Soviet Government offered, through its highest economic council, a program for making America the most favored foreign nation in trade and commerce and involving the control by the Allies of all those supplies most desired by the Central Empires?"

"Is it true that the Department of State has refused to allow the American Red Cross to ship supplies to Moscow and Petrograd for the relief of the returning Russian war prisoners from Germany?"

"Is it true that refusal of these recommendations prevented the evacuation of large amounts of munitions and war supplies from the eastern front that subsequently were captured by the Germans in their advance after the Brest negotiations had failed?"

Asking if America might be partly responsible for starvation and terrorism in Russia, Senator Johnson wanted to know whether this country's purpose was to war against revolution in all countries "to prevent the agitation for revolution from spreading."

Referring to what he termed "strange modifications" of armistice terms delaying withdrawal of German troops from Russia, Senator Johnson asked:

"Can it be that the German-bribed Bolsheviks acting in conjunction with Germany, . . . must be kept in order by German troops?"

"If a league of nations was to be formed upon any such motives it will degenerate into a holy alliance. A policy of military intervention, supporting one Government here and another there, one faction in one part and one faction in another, will but encourage every revolutionary group."

"The extraordinary amount of misinformation given to the American people concerning Russia almost justifies the belief that there has been a regular and consistent propaganda of misrepresentation. The Creel Bureau of Public Information has apparently been engaged, not in developing facts to our people, but in justifying a course subsequently pursued at variance with our words. Solemnly we promised that we would not, by hostile invasion intervene. We did, after our solemn promise, just that thing, and then in the sequence of events, apparently, the duty developed on the Creel bureau to justify the broken promise."

"As calmly we weigh what has been transpiring in Austria and Germany, as we observe the insidious propaganda and the poison of Bolshevism emanating from Russia, which have gone to the very core of the autocracy of the central empires, can we be satisfied with the Creel committee's labored efforts to demonstrate that the Bolsheviks are German agents?"

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe.

LOUIS C. FRANK Editor
EUGENE MACALUSSE Associate Editor
Contributing Editors

SCOTT NEWMAN LUDWIG LARS
JOHN RISS SEN KAKIMURA
N. L. HOLMWAY G. WEINSTEIN

ISSUED EVERY WEDNESDAY AND SATURDAY

By Local Posters, Socialist Party

H. G. SCHNER, Business Manager

885 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

Three months, \$1.00; bundles, 20 a copy

Wednesday, December 11, 1918

The Great Deception

A tremendous reception has been accorded President Wilson in France. Dignitaries of the Republic have waited and dined him, words of welcome have been bandied back and forth—a great historical moment, duly recorded by the press and the movies. But the distinguishing feature of the reception is that a large amount of popular feeling was evoked, the as yet unconscious masses picturing President Wilson as the personification of the new age and the new democracy. The intense longings of the masses for lasting peace, the inarticulate aspiration for a new world, are being expressed in a temporary exaltation of the President, whose generous use of the phraseology of idealism and democracy has captivated the American masses and a large section of the European masses. This is another great tragedy of history. The American and European masses, as yet, do not see the depths of reaction that stalk behind the screens of the words of democracy. As the enthusiasm of the war has passed, the deception of it all is apparent, and a great sorrow will become the deception of the words of democracy. The tragedy of Capitalism is that it mobilizes the energy, the courage, the enthusiasm and idealism of the masses for the purposes of reaction; but already the masses are awakening to the recognition of this, and their energy and idealism is being transformed into the international struggle for Socialism.

Waging the Class Struggle

THE press reports that a French "Socialist" delegation met the President, who answered with an address, declaring that "this has indeed been a people's war . . . waged against absolutism and militarism," and that "those who lead your own great nation" are for a new world and a League of Nations. Clemenceau and the Ministry of Reaction, the Ministry of Reaction and the French Bourgeoisie! The new world they create will be a world of capital and the tyranny of capital. The majority "Socialists" in France are again nobly waging the class struggle, precisely as is the British Labor Party. The acceptance of the President's "14 points" by majority "Socialism" in France and England and by the British Labor Party has enormously complicated our task of awakening the American proletariat, as well as awakening the proletariat of France and Britain. The straight and sure tactic is—dependence alone upon the class struggle of the Socialist proletariat.

A Challenge to a Liar

THE bourgeois press has never lied as often, as infamously, as it lies these days about revolutionary Socialist Russia. And it isn't simple the yellow gutter press that lies; the most preposterous lies are manufactured by the "respectable" and "intellectual" press: the gutter and the university, the intellectual and the roughneck, are a unity against Russia. The "Christian Science Monitor," in an editorial in its December 13, issue, lies stupidly and viciously.

Says the "Monitor":

"She [Germany] called to her aid the two international Jews [Ulanoff [Lenin] and Bronstein [Trotsky] conveyed them across her territory to the Russian frontier . . ."

Lie No. 1: Ulanoff-Lenin is not a Jew, but a pure Russian, of the Cossack petty nobility.

Lie No. 2: Bronstein-Trotsky was not transported

across Germany to Russia; he left New York, was seized by the British and landed at Halifax, released upon demand of the Russian government, and entered Russia by way of Sweden.

Says the moral, intellectual and clean "Monitor": "And so, with all restraints thrown aside, and the vodka shops once again thrown open, liberty in all directions quickly degenerated into license and anarchy." (Under the Soviet regime.)

Lie No. 3: The Soviets were the one great force against drink. Drink promotes the power of the Black Hundreds, not the power of Socialism.

Says the religious, God-fearing "Monitor": "In the German organization of Bolshevism in Russia . . ."

Lie No. 4: Bolshevism is not German; on the contrary, the conception of Socialism violently opposed by Bolshevism was typified in the dominant Socialism of Germany. Fact: It is Germany that is now importing from Russia, and not Russia that imported Bolshevism from Germany.

We do not challenge the editorial liar of the "Monitor" to retract these stupid lies. It is useless to ask this. Of course they have no real case against the Bolsheviks, and must resort to lies; to retract these lies, might mean the awakening of the American proletariat; and this might mean—more Bolshevism!

The Beam in Our Eye

THE psychology of the American ruling class, which necessarily filters down into the consciousness of the workers, is very peculiar. The American ruling class boasts of "the utmost in democracy," and denounces the millions of regimes of practically every right of democracy; it preaches of "civilization" and "humanity," and practices lynching, found nowhere else in the world; it shouts about workers here being "unfree," and tortures strikers with a brutality that in any other country would almost provoke revolution; it first speaks about the war "to make the world safe for democracy," and then says democracy and free speech more effectively than any other belligerent country, imposes sentences upon political offenders more savage than those that were imposed by the imperial German autocracy. It is a psychology compounded of conceit and hypocrisy, of savagery and vicious morality—an effective instrument against the proletariat. One of its particular boasts was the very high level of education in the United States, coupled with sneers about other nations' illiteracy. Well, Secretary of the Interior Lane, in his annual report and an accompanying letter, shows facts that he considers "almost unbelievable" and "in themselves accusatory" about illiteracy in the United States. In 1908 there were 5,635,163 persons more than ten years old who could neither read nor write English or any other language—more than 20 per cent. of the population. According to the census of 1900, the percentage of native white illiterates born of native parents was 3.7; of native whites of foreign or mixed parentage, 1.1; of foreign-born white, 12.7; of negroes, 30. Most of the illiterate nations of Europe make a finer showing. These boasts are means of exhortation. But the awakening of the proletariat is coming.

They Are Still There

THE questions asked by Senator Hiram Johnson about American relations with Russia and about what American troops are doing in Russia have not yet been answered. The press reports that Allied troops may march into Russian territory evacuated by the German troops "to maintain order." French marines have occupied Odessa, where they have absolutely no business unless it is counter-revolutionary business. British Minister of Foreign Affairs Balfour declares that there is no responsible government in Russia that could be represented at the Peace Conference, and indicates that Russia is one of "the backward nations" that the League of Nations should be "trustee of, and help them along the steady path of progress." The American War Trade Board has made definite plans to reopen trade relations with Russia—that is, with those parts of Russia not controlled by

the Bolsheviks, which are inconsequential. The process of starving Russia is still in action. . . . And after troops are still in Archangel and Vladivostok.

The Labor Party

THERE is a movement developing among the unions of the American Federation of Labor to organize a Labor Party. The movement seems acquiring definite character and strength, central labor councils in a number of cities having approved of the proposal.

This may, in a measure, be a reflex of the similar movement among the Canadian unions. It is, it will longer measures, an expression of the new currents that the war and events in Europe are developing among the world's working class—expressed in immature and conservative form. It is, accordingly, a move that, while it should not meet enthusiastic uncritical acceptance, merits the serious study of the Socialist who does not flee from reality by means of phrases, nor accepts every "reality" as real, but who studies the social alignment as a means of developing appropriate Socialist tactics.

The organization of an American Labor Party may prove a step forward for the A. F. of L., but not necessarily a step forward for the American proletariat. The A. F. of L., which has insisted all along upon "no politics in the unions" while dickering and compromising with Democratic and Republican politicians, may develop a clearer sense of independence by means of independent politics. It may, moreover, by showing the fertility of A. F. of L. politics, hasten the day of real Socialist political action by the proletariat.

The New York "Call" wails that there is no necessity for a Labor Party since the Socialist Party has been in the field for twenty years. This is either an admission that the Socialist Party is no more than a Labor Party, or a Menshevik refusal to admit the fundamental differences between a Labor Party and a Socialist party. In either event it is counter-Socialism.

What is a Labor Party? The Labor Party, in England and in Australia, has been, from the standpoint of revolutionary Socialism, hopelessly reactionary and un-proletarian. The British Labor Party's policy is a petty bourgeois policy, a counter-revolutionary policy, as has been clearly apparent by its unity with imperialistic Capitalism in the British Cabinet, by its declaration that the war was a war of democracy, by accepting petty bourgeois liberalism instead of proletarian Socialism, by its petty bourgeois, nationalistic proposals concerning Ireland, by its virtual acquiescence in the expulsion of Maxim Gorkh from England, by its acceptance of the resolution of the Inter-Allied Labor Conference favoring "democratic" intervention in Russia, by its bureaucracy through Arthur Henderson acting against every development of revolutionary energy and initiative in the British proletariat. The British Labor Party has been a typical party of laborism, in that it struggles for a place in the governing system of things, for petty advantages to the upper layers of the working class instead of struggling for the overthrow of the governing bourgeois system. The British Labor Party has been and is a party of social-imperialism, its policy in tendency the reactionary policy of majority Socialism and unionism in Germany,—except in the case of more radical, oppositional unions.

A characteristic of laborism is that it acts against the broad masses of the industrial proletariat, against the unorganized proletariat of unskilled labor. The "labor" government in Australia, once in power, used armed forces to break the strikers of unorganized, unskilled workers. Moreover, the "labor" government, instead of introducing "Socialism," as was expected by the gullible Socialist, strengthened Capitalism, became the uniting centre of bourgeois reaction and outlived in "liberal" colors. When the war broke, "labor" Australia was even more patriotic and imperialistic than bourgeois Canada. "Labor" Premier William Morris Hughes becoming the particular pet of the ultra-imperialistic forces of British Capitalism. There has been a revolt against the "excesses"

of Hughes, and more radical currents are developing in the Australian Labor Party under pressure of the industrial proletariat and revolutionary Socialism, but the tendency still remains characteristic of a Labor Party.

When the transport workers, miners and unorganized workers in New Zealand in 1913 determined upon a general strike, the skilled labor unions refused to strike and scabbed, while the Labor Party issued a manifesto against the strike. The struggle between the unions of the aristocracy of labor and the industrial proletariat became so keen that a new party was organized representing the industrial masses, the Social Democratic Federation.

The Irish Labor Party is the only labor party that does not express the full policy of laborism. It acquired a proletarian class policy after the Dublin strike in 1912-13 and cooperates with the unskilled workers. During the war, it adopted a radical oppositional attitude, but its recent decision to withdraw its parliamentary candidates in favor of the Sinn Fein candidates indicates an abandonment of the straight path of proletarian action for the tortuous ways of compromise with the Irish bourgeoisie.

The tendency of laborism, of a Labor Party, is the petty bourgeois tendency of compromise, of conciliation with Capitalism, of securing advantages for itself by betraying the masses of the industrial proletariat and accepting social-Imperialism.

An American Labor Party will express precisely the tendency and purposes of the A. F. of L. These purposes and tendency are notoriously reactionary. The A. F. of L. is not interested in the great industrial proletariat of unorganized, unskilled labor—the bulk of the working class; in fact, the A. F. of L. has repeatedly acted against and betrayed its strikes, particularly when directed by the I. W. W. The A. F. of L. is largely an organization of "job trusts" of the aristocracy of labor, which strives simply for petty advantages, and which has again and again united with Capitalism against Socialism and the proletariat. The A. F. of L., moreover, through its bureaucracy, has during the war been even more reactionary than the most reactionary elements of Capitalism, smugly satisfied that the war was bringing steady employment and high wages; and this bureaucracy, through Samuel Gompers & Co., directly united with Imperialism in Europe against Socialism and the awakening of the proletariat—even the British Labor Party was too "radical" for Gompers & Co. Gompers developed into an instrument of Lloyd-George and Clemenceau against the working class.

The tendency and purposes of the Labor Party, should it eventuate, will express the reactionary tendency and purposes of the A. F. of L. That is scarcely anything to jubilate about.

But, then, would a Labor Party be simply an evil? Not at all; it might indirectly promote progress by demonstrating on the larger field of politics the weak, petty policy of the A. F. of L., might in that way prove an educational force, and clarify the situation in a large degree. That is, providing that Socialism would adapt itself to the new conditions and would not become a cat's-paw for the Labor Party.

There are elements in the Socialist Party whose policy is not at all Socialist, but the policy of reactionary trades unionism and laborism, and who would welcome a Labor Party. These elements would insist that the Socialist Party identify itself in some way with the Labor Party, either become absorbed in the new party or a part of it, such as the Independent Labor Party in England. This would be disastrous to revolutionary Socialism, identifying Socialism with laborism. The Socialist Party should maintain its independence and Socialist identity.

But it must be admitted that the official majority policy of the Socialist Party is largely the policy of a Labor Party; and should the party retain this policy, it would stagnate and the Labor Party conquer. The organization of a Labor Party, accordingly, would be a call to the Socialist Party to recognize itself, to adopt a policy representing the tendency and requirements of the industrial proletariat, to reconstruct itself with the new revolutionary Socialist ideas now de-

veloping a new pulse in international Socialism—ideas which alone represent Socialism and Marxism.

The Socialist Party would have to irrevocably and uncompromisingly separate itself from a Labor Party and wage war upon it. Wage war—how? Not by promising more reforms than the Labor Party, but by a propaganda of revolutionary Socialism and industrial unionism, by awakening and directing the action of the great unorganized masses of the industrial proletariat. This would mean a broadening of the conception and practice of politics—a broadening fully in accord with Marxism and fundamental Socialism.

The A. F. of L. does not represent the elements of the real proletariat—the industrial proletariat massed in the basic larger industry. The A. F. of L., except in the case of anachronisms such as the miners represents the skilled workers, the aristocracy of labor, men who have skill and consider this skill "property." Their ideology is a petty bourgeois ideology, and their domination of Socialism and the industrial proletariat would prove a calamity. The answer to the A. F. of L. compromise and petty bourgeois policy is to awaken the industrial proletariat, and pull out of the A. F. of L. unions, such as the Miners, who belong with the industrial proletariat.

Socialism must have an economic basis—industrial power. But this will not be provided by the A. F. of L. or the policy of Laborism—did the British Labor Party use industrial power to secure for its delegates access to international conferences held outside of England? The industrial power of Socialism must come out of the militant proletariat in the larger industry, from the propaganda and practice of industrial unionism and industrial mass action.

Should the Labor Party eventuate, this reconstruction of the Socialist Party policy becomes imperative; thus reconstruction is equally necessary should the Labor Party not eventuate. The Socialist Party must attune itself to the rhythm of new ideas in international Socialism.

There is no magic in "labor,"—it depends upon what "labor" represents, its tendency and action. There is no magic in "Socialism," either. Both may prove reactionary and counter-revolutionary. The great task of international Socialism at this moment is its own reconstruction—the final struggle against Capitalism and Imperialism is on!

Bolshevism in America

By John Reed

In response to anxious queries from our capitalist acquaintances as to the danger of a Bolshevik Revolution in the United States within the next two weeks, we wish to settle the question once for all.

1. The American working-class is politically and economically the most uneducated working class in the world. It believes what it reads in the capitalist press. It believes that the wage-system is ordained by God. It believes that Charley Schwab is a great man, because he can make money. It believes that Samuel Gompers and the American Federation of Labor will protect it as much as it can be protected. It believes that under our system of Government the Millennium is possible. When the Democrats are in power, it believes the promises of the Republicans, and vice versa. It believes that Labor laws mean what they say. It is prejudiced against Socialism.

Note: Organized Labor's candidate for Governor of California, Mayor Rolfe, was a very ordinary type of bourgeois politician. Through a technicality his name was removed from the ballot. This meant his certain defeat. Labor was asked why it didn't throw its weight solidly behind the Socialist ticket? "Oh," answered Labor, "the Socialists will never get elected. What's the use of throwing away your vote?" I am told that Labor wrote Rolfe's name on the ballot, and Stephens won.

2. American Labor disapproves of the Russian Soviets, the German Revolution, and other manifestations of "anarchy." To the American working class the British Labor Party is "going a little too far"; it seems to be dominated by "nuts." As for the French

and Italian movements, who cares what the "wops" do?

Note: On November 7th some Socialists had a pamphlet printed to celebrate the first anniversary of the founding of the Soviet Government. When they went to get it at the binder's, a member of the Typographical Union said, "I don't know whether I'll give you this stuff or not. It's all about the Bolsheviks. You guys ought to be arrested!"

3. With the exception of the Jewish workers, other foreigners, and a devoted sprinkling of Americans, the Socialist party is made up largely of petty bourgeois, for the most part occupied in electing Aldermen and Assemblymen to office, where they turn into time-serving politicians, and in explaining that Socialism does not mean Free Love. The composition of the English-speaking branches is: little shopkeepers, clerks, doctors, lawyers, farmers (in the Middle West), a few teachers, some skilled workers, and a handful of intellectuals.

Nothing is farther from the normal desires of the American Socialist party than a Revolution. It is really the refuge of almost all intelligent humble people who believe in the principles on which the American Republic was founded. It has never altogether approved of the Bolsheviks. It applauds the German Revolution largely because it thinks that the Germans will be more orderly.

4. There is no well-defined Left or Revolutionary wing in the Socialist party. This fact has driven many workers, dissatisfied with industrial conditions and disillusioned with politics, to join the I. W. W., a revolutionary organization dominated by Syndicalist ideas. As in France and Denmark, the Syndicalist philosophy has captured the imagination of the revolutionary proletariat; although in the United States there is a very small revolutionary proletariat. . . .

5. This is just another proof that in America the Socialist movement is divorced from the great mass of the working class. The main differences between this country and Europe is that in Europe the Labor Unions were organized by the Socialists, on class-conscious lines; while in America Organized Labor is in theory a defensive group of citizens with similar interests in a theoretical democracy where all men are equal.

6. In the United States the Socialists have some power. They can swing a million votes. The official majority in the Socialist party is more interested in "swinging" these votes than in Socialism. But they cannot compete with bourgeois reform groups like the Progressives, or the Democrats under Wilson.

7. Nothing teaches the American working class except hard times and repression. Hard times are coming, repression is organized on a grand scale. In America for a long time there has been no free land, nor opportunity for workers to become millionaires. The working class does not yet know this.

The very fact that for the next decade America promises to be the most reactionary quarter of the globe is sure to have its effect.

8. If Tom Mooney stays in jail, if wages go down, if Socialists are arrested and the red flag suppressed, there will be a revolutionary movement in this country in five years. Bismarck couldn't stop it in Germany.

The War Trade Board has laid plans for reopening trade relations with those sections of Russia not controlled by the Bolsheviks. We wonder is this another way of saying that business is to be continued with Stockholm.

Perhaps the new "Russian" Government recently organized in the Swedish capital has placed an order for writing materials with which to carry on its functions.

It looks very like Italian-determination for the Jugo-Slavs.

Speaking at Nottingham, England, the other day, "J. R. Clynes, ex-laborite, frankly admitted that he shared the views of the premier. . . ." says a press despatch. If his confession was voluntarily it ought to be considered in his favor.

Japan and Siberian Intervention

By Sen Katayama

SIBERIAN intervention was first undertaken by the Terauchi Ministry, the predecessor of the present Hara government. It was this intervention that was one of the causes of the great food riots that occurred all over the country just at the time of the departure of General Otani for Siberia to command the Allied Army. The unpopularity of the Siberian expedition and the popular demonstration against the militarism of the Terauchi ministry, in the form of fierce food riots, were the chief causes of the fall of the government.

Baron Uchida, the former ambassador to Petrograd and present Minister of Foreign Affairs, led the fight against intervention in Siberia, and finally succeeded in overthrowing Terauchi. If he possesses any conscience, his first act as Minister of Foreign Affairs should be the withdrawal of the Japanese troops from Siberia.

Even under the Terauchi ministry the Japanese press frequently characterized the sending of troops to Siberia as "a meaningless act," or more severely as "an outrageous proceeding," but still the Japanese soldiers are in Siberia. All we know about the attitude of the Hara government towards Russia and the Russians is that so far it has not expressed any inimical feeling towards the Bolsheviks. Premier Hara has even gone so far as to state that his government will recognize any stable government in Russia, "Bolshevik or otherwise."

Japan's foreign policy, or, rather, lack of foreign policy, is inherently weak and is consequently easily influenced by the other capitalist nations. But it is apparent that the Hara government will recognize the Bolshevik government as it becomes increasingly clear that it is the stable government. The prediction, made while he was still ambassador to Petrograd, then the seat of the Russian Soviet Republic, that Bolshevism was "the world-wide power that will eventually dominate Europe—first Austria-Hungary, then Germany, and finally end the present war," shows that Uchida must have been impressed by the Bolshevik ideas of freedom. But now he is the foreign minister of the present government. . . .

The Hara ministry has been very favorably reported in the foreign press as the first of the Japanese party governments whose premier is a commoner, without any title. Truly Hara is the recognized leader of the Seiyukai, the majority party of the lower house of the Japanese parliament, but he is an opportunist in his political faith and conduct. He was Minister of the Interior under the Yamamoto ministry and even supported the bureaucratic government of Prince Katsura and that of his predecessor, Terauchi.

The only difference between this government and that of the former premier is that Hara is neither a count nor a marquis, but simply Mr. Hara. This may seem of very great importance to some who are accustomed to the usage of Japan, but the Hara ministry is not a popular government at all. It is, however, not a clan government, inasmuch as it was not dominated by either the Choshu or Sassin clans as were all the former ministries; it is distinctly a capitalist government supported by the influence of the clans. An incisive characterization of the Hara ministry is given by Comrade Sakai in "The New Society," the only Socialist monthly published in Tokyo:

"The Hara ministry, a ministry of capital, which is termed a People's government, is formed. Mr. Noda, Minister of Transportation, represents the Fukuoka Seiyukai. He is called a 'minister of the people,' but really represents Mitsui, the millionaire, and the cotton and coal industries of Japan. Mr. Nakabayashi, Minister of Education, represents the millionaires of Fuzita and Osaka, and also the Osaka Merchant Marine Company. Mr. Yamamoto, Minister of Agriculture and Commerce, and Mr. Takahashi, Minister of the Treasury, represents varied financial and industrial interests. Mr. Tokoname, Minister of the Interior, represents the money power and the clan interests of the Sassin. While Mr. Hara represents the Seiyukai as a whole; he, at the same time, looks after the interests of Furukawa, the copper king of Japan.

"It is a party government as against the clan or bureaucratic government. But in reality it is a gov-

ernment of capitalists. Only its body represents the Seiyukai, its tail is the landed interests, while its neck and head are industrial and commercial capital. In itself it contains the germ of the coming conflict of interests. The Seiyukai represents the Mitsui influence, while the Kenmeikai, the opposition party, represents the Iwawaki-Mitsubishi money power. The late governor of Kyoto, Mr. Kioeki, now in prison on account of an election scandal, is a son-in-law of Iwawaki-Mitsubishi, a millionaire, as is also Mr. Kio, president of the Kenmeikai. Here is the beginning of a conflict between two great money powers.

"As the struggle for power between the money powers, clan powers, industrial and commercial powers and the landlords develops, each and all these people will more or less attempt to cajole the majority of the common people. In this conflict the people's power will be strengthened."

Comrade Sakai's analysis of the Hara ministry is very interesting and very true, but he omits one important figure in that ministry: Minister of the Army Tanaka. Tanaka, representing the Crown class, is a well-known Japanese general—the von Moltke of Japan—and an ardent advocate of intervention in Siberia. As long as this imperialist is Minister of the Army, the policy of Japan towards Russia will be dominated by militarists. However, the destruction of German militarism and the miserable fall of Klemens will be a check on the Japanese militarists, while Uchida's influence will be strengthened by the power of Bolshevism in Europe.

The Hara ministry is a camouflage popular government, a party government in name, but in reality dominated by the Japanese capitalists and as bottomed by the same old autocratic influences. At the same time this corrupted, capitalistic and oppressive government will hasten the final crash of the impending reaction.

The recent awakening of the workers in Japan is nothing remarkable, but they have already realized their power by the recent riots—the power of their hunger. Bolshevism will reach Japan soon. The Japanese workers are preparing for it as the capitalist exploitation increases and the government becomes ever and ever more oppressive and brutal.

Divide and Rule

DIVIDE and rule—such is one of the basic principles of the imperialistic policy. With this principle in mind, imperialists among the Allies are being guided while they aid and deepen the separatist movement in the former Empires of the Hohenollerns and Hapsburgs. The more Chinese Walls are built around the numerous peoples in Central Europe, the better will it be for imperialism and the worse for the cause of the proletarian revolution. In this respect, the interests of the proletarian revolution and the interests of imperialists among the Allies are directly opposed.

Let us take the most striking example. The Austrian-Germans quite definitely expressed their desire to join the German proletarian republic. The interests of the proletarian revolution can but gain because of this. Moreover, the decision of the Austrian Germans to join Germany is quite natural from the purely national point of view. Why, then, a question arises, should obstacles be created against this normal desire?

The imperialists among the Allies, however, have already begun to protest. The organ of Parisian plutocracy, the "Matin," declares against the political union of these two sections of the German people, and the president of the Chamber of Deputies, Deschanel, states openly that the Allies will take care that this union should not be realized. Probably, threats will be used to transfer part of the contribution from the shoulders of the Germans to the Austrian shoulders, or some such measures. The imperialists are always resourceful in choosing means—if not by sword, then by hook—to attain their aims of plunder.

A union of all Germans, from the point of view of the imperialists among the Allies, is inadmis-

sible. Of course, the matter changes when the thing concerns the possible disunion of such a people. The rumor that Bavaria intended to separate from Germany was met with loud approval.

Such an attitude is quite natural: the imperialists among the Allies need a weak, broken-up Germany, since such a Germany will not become an imperialistic competitor. Moreover, Germany may become a Socialist republic, and a strong Socialist Germany might become a deadly menace to international capitalism.

Let us go further, however. The existence of a long row of small "independent" states will create the political atmosphere of perpetual national conflicts, the classical example of which were the Balkans. The sharks of the large State imperialism find it very convenient to catch fish in the waters of mutual distrust and nationalistic passions among the small states.

One ought not go very far for examples. The Polish nationalists in Galicia have already begun a deadly struggle with the Ruthenian nationalists. In the vicinity of Lvov and Przemyel big battles have already taken place. And this is merely a beginning!

The so-called Great-Serbian aspirations are far from being ideal. Between Serbs, Croats and Slovenes an open hostility has broken out. This will play into the hands of Italian imperialism. The enmity between Serbians and Hungarians, it is understood, will not be liquidated with the war's end. The far from friendly relations between Polish and Lithuanian nationalists will surely result in open hostilities. It is not any better in Hungary, with her numerous Slav population.

As experience shows the labor movement loses a great deal where national conflicts and disagreement dull the edge of the class struggle. There were cases, as, for instance, in Bohemia, where numerous proletarian elements went over to the ranks of petty-bourgeois nationalists. We must not forget, also, the circumstances that the boundaries of small states in the highest degree narrow the breadth of the revolutionary movement. Narrow national boundaries of a small state chain the hands and feet of the international movement. The horizon of a Socialist conception is narrowed and localized. The mire of petty, everyday questions swamps the movement and it loses sight of the larger international perspective. It is a very good ground for the growth of schemes of petty national and opportunist activities.

The interests of a revolutionary labor movement, the interests of the coming Socialist system of society, insistently demand a wide anti-organization on the principle of federation. This is the ideal we most strive for. Its realization depends on two conditions: on the strength of a Socialist revolutionary movement in a given country and on the aid which may come from the Socialist movement in other countries. Only through the concerted efforts of the whole conscious revolutionary proletariat can we hope to overcome the plottings of international imperialism and its hirings among the "liberated" nationalities. A Federated Proletarian Republic in the former Danube monarchy, a Federated Proletarian Republic in the Balkans, a united Socialist Germany—such, and such only, is the solution of the "national" controversy splitting these countries. And this promotes Socialism.

The International Revolution

By N. Lenin

Speech delivered before the All-Russian Soviet Executive Committee, October 22, 1918.

I BELIEVE our present situation, despite all the contradictions it contains, can be characterized by two theses: First, that we never before stood so near to the international proletarian revolution as at present; second, that we on the other hand never found ourselves in a more dangerous position than now.

And the most serious part of our situation consists in the fact that the broad masses of the people are hardly aware of the danger that menaces us. Therefore it must be one of the principal tasks of the Soviet representatives to make the present situation entirely clear to the broad masses—no matter how difficult this task may sometimes be. The weightiest objection that was raised against the Soviet Government, not only by the bourgeoisie but also from the ranks of the lower middle class that had lost faith in Socialism, was that we allegedly had begun the Socialist revolution in Russia in a reckless manner, as the revolution in Western Europe was not yet due.

Comrades, now in the fifth year of the world war the general collapse of Imperialism is an evident fact; now it is clear that the revolution in all the belligerent countries is unavoidable. We, however, whose existence at the beginning was counted by days or weeks, at the most, have done more in this year of the revolution than ever has been done by any other proletarian party in the world. The bourgeoisie no longer denies that Bolshevism is now an international phenomenon. Of course, you know that the revolution has broken out in Bulgaria and that the Bulgarian soldiers are organizing councils, or Soviets, after the Russian model. Now comes the news that similar Soviets are in the process of being organized also in Serbia. The national bourgeoisie of the various small States of Austria will not be able to hold out. In Austria, too, the revolution of the workers and peasants is knocking at the door everywhere.

In Germany the press already talks openly of the abdication of the Kaiser and the Independent Social Democratic Party now dares to speak of the German republic. This certainly means something! The German revolution is already a fact. The military party talks about it openly. In East Prussia revolutionary committees have been formed; revolutionary slogans are being uttered. The Scheidemann gang will not remain at the helm very long; it does not represent the broad masses of the people, and the proletarian revolution in Germany is inevitable.

So far as Italy is concerned, the revolutionary sentiment of the proletariat of that country is evident to us. When Gompers, the social patriot who has turned himself over to the bourgeoisie, visited the cities of Italy and preached patriotism to the workers he was hissed out everywhere. During the war the Italian Socialist Party has taken a big step toward the Left. In France at the beginning of the war the number of patriots among the workers was only too great, for it was declared that the soil of France and Paris was menaced. But there, too, the attitude of the proletariat is changing. When a letter was read to the last convention telling what mischief the Entente was up to in Russia there were shouts of "Long live the Russian Socialist Republic!" and "Long live the Soviets!" Yesterday we got word that at a meeting held in Paris 2,000 metal workers greeted the Soviet Republic.

And in England it is true that the so-called Independent Labor Party has not openly entered into an alliance with the Bolsheviks, but its sympathies for us are constantly on the increase. The Socialist Labor Parties of Scotland have even come out openly for the Bolsheviks.

This fact looms up before us entirely on its own initiative: Bolshevism has become a world theory and the tactics of the international proletariat. And the workmen of all countries, who formerly read only the lying and calumnious articles and news reports of the bourgeois press, are now beginning to take stock of what is happening in Russia. And when last Wednesday a demonstration took place in Berlin, and the workers—in order to show their ill-will toward the Kaiser—wanted to march in front of his palace, they

then went to the Russian Embassy in order thus to announce their solidarity with the acts of the Russian Proletarian Government.

So, Europe has got this far in the fifth year of the war. Therefore, we also declare that we never were so near to the world-wide revolution as we are today. Our allies are millions and millions of proletarians in all the countries of the world. But for all that, I repeat that our situation never before was so precarious as it is at present, because in Europe, as well as in America, Bolshevism is being reckoned with as a world power and a world danger.

Immediately following the conclusion of the peace of violence [Brest-Litovsk] we began the positive work of building up the Socialist republic. As soon as we gave an opportunity to the peasants actually to get along without the land owners, and a chance to the industrial workers to arrange their own life without the capitalists, as soon as the people understood that it could manage the State itself, without slavery and exploitation, then it became clear to everyone, and also manifested itself in practice, that no power and no counter-revolution in the world would be able to overthrow the Soviet power, i. e., the government of the workers and peasants. It required many months for us to come to this conviction in Russia.

In the cities the revolution began to consolidate itself already in November, 1917, but in the country it did not do so until the Summer of 1918. In the Ukraine, on the Don, and in various other places, the peasants have had occasion to feel the power of the Constituents and the Czechoslovaks in their own affairs. This required many, many months, but our agricultural population comes out of the struggle hardened. The peasants finally became aware of the danger menacing them from the side of the capitalists and the land owners, but were not frightened, and merely said to themselves: "We have learned much in a single year, but we shall learn still more."

The West European bourgeoisie, that up to now has not taken the Bolsheviks seriously, is now becoming aware that in Russia a power has arisen and stands there alone which is able to arouse true heroism and a genuine spirit of self sacrifice in the masses. When this proletarian power began to infect Europe the bourgeoisie of the world noted that it, too, must reckon with this enemy. And so the bourgeoisie began to unite more closely in proportion as we drew nearer to the proletarian world revolution which flared up, now here, now there.

Now the situation for us, for the Russia of the Soviets, has changed and events are following their course at a quickened pace. Before, we had to deal with two groups of imperialistic robber States, that were striving to destroy each other. But now they have noticed, especially by the example of German Imperialism, that their principal enemy is the revolutionary proletariat. By reason of this fact a new danger for us has now arisen, a danger that as yet has not quite unfolded itself, and is not yet fully visible—the danger that the Anglo-French Imperialists are quietly preparing for us. We must keep this danger clearly before our eyes so that we, with the aid of the leaders of the masses, with the help of the representatives of the workers and peasants, may make the broad masses of the people aware of this danger.

In German Government circles we may now observe two lines of thought, two plans for salvation, as it were, if there can be any talk at all of salvation. One group says: "We want to gain time and hold out until Spring; perhaps we may succeed in winning by arms!" The other says that it is of the greatest importance to arrive at an agreement with England and France at the expense of the Bolsheviks. In this connection one might believe that between the English and French on the one side, and Germany on the other,

a tacit agreement something like this exists: "Don't you Germans leave the Ukraine so long as we have not arrived there. See to it that the Bolsheviks don't get in, then everything else will be adjusted." And the Germans take great care to do so, for they know that for proved service they, too, will get some of the loot.

That is the judgment of the Anglo-French imperialists, for they very well understand that the bourgeoisie of the occupied districts—Finland, the Ukraine, or Poland—will not be able to hold its ground a single day after the withdrawal of the German garrisons. And the bourgeoisie of these countries, who only yesterday sold their territory to the Germans, are today offering their fatherland to the English and the French. This conspiracy of the bourgeoisie of all countries against the revolutionary workers and the Bolsheviks is constantly becoming more clearly outlined and becomes cynically apparent. So it is our direct duty to point out this danger to the workers and peasants of all the belligerent countries.

But for us, comrades, the German revolution is favorable. Considering the power and the degree of organization of the German proletariat, we may believe that the German revolution will develop such power and will be so well organized that it will solve a hundred international problems. Only we must know how to march in line with the German revolution, not to run ahead of it and injure it, but to help it. And our comrades, the communists of the Ukraine, must bear this in mind. Our principal work must be carrying on propaganda, but a daring, persistent propaganda.

We must not forget that Germany forms the most important link in the revolutionary chain. The success of the world revolution depends to the greatest degree upon Germany. We must not fail to consider the changes and excrescences accompanying every revolution. In every country the revolution follows its particular ways and these ways are so different and tortuous that in many countries the revolution can be delayed one or two years. Every country must pass through definite political stages in order to arrive at the very same point—the inevitable proletarian revolution. And although the international proletariat is now awakening and making important progress, we must confess that our position is particularly difficult because our enemies direct their attacks against us as their principal enemy. Now they are preparing to fight, not against the hostile armies, but against international Bolshevism.

We must direct our entire attention at present to our southern front, where the fate, not only of Russia, but also of the international revolution, is to be decided. We have many prospects of victory. But what favors us most of all is the fact that a change has taken place in the popular feeling. The people have grasped the fact that in defending Soviet Russia it is not defending the interests of the capitalists, but its own interests, its own country and desires, its factories and shops, its life and liberty. The discipline of the Red Army is gaining, but it is not a discipline of the club, but the discipline of Socialism, the discipline of a society of equals.

The army is turning out thousands of officers who have gone through the course of study in the new proletarian military schools, and other thousands who have only gone through the hard school of war itself. Our southern front is the front against the whole Anglo-French imperialism, against the most important opponent we have in the world. But we do not fear this opponent, for we know that it will soon face the struggle with its "internal enemy." Three months ago it was said that only the half-crazy Bolsheviks could believe in the German revolution; but today we see how in the course of a few months Germany has changed from a mighty empire to a rotten tree trunk. The force that has overthrown Germany is also working in England. It is only weak today, but with every step that the English and French advance in Russia

(Continued on Page 6)

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat

By S. J. Rutgers

"POLITICAL power properly so-called is merely the organized power of one class oppressing another," says the Communist Manifesto. At present the political power of the capitalist class, organized in the capitalist State and capitalist government, serves the purpose of protecting and enforcing the exploitation of the proletariat class. Class division excludes democracy because the interests of one class, the ruling class, must prevail. The ruling class always has been a minority class, as it would not be necessary for a majority class to "rule." Democracy being incompatible with a society based on class antagonism, no form of bourgeois "democracy" can ever be real democracy.

Real democracy must secure conditions and decisions in accordance with the interests of society as a whole, and if we find that a "democratic" government is used to secure the interests of a minority class, there is something wrong with that kind of democracy. Without going into details how the specific "democratic" system accomplishes its special aims, we know as a fact that there is some scheme to prevent democracy working out democratically. In fact the prevailing institutions, customs, laws, morals, etc., of a class society largely have no other purpose than to create sentiments and conditions which operate to make people support their own oppressors. The working class and those groups whose interests are one with the interests of the working class, largely through intellectual and moral influences, are brought to betray their ultimate class interests. Such is the power of control over the economic conditions and over the instruments of civilization—schools, churches, public opinion, newspapers, science, art, etc.

Only to a very limited extent, only to the extent to which the ruling class needs a certain amount of freedom in its own interest, can the oppressed class counteract this control by propaganda and education. If the capitalists could put each worker in a separate cell to sweat out profits without contact with his fellow-workers, the system might be permanized altogether and no amount of general suffrage and vote casting would be of any effect.

The present situation under Capitalism, is not quite so "perfect," but still conditions are maintained in such shape as to enable a minority to rule. Even though we may not always be able to find out how it works, we know by its results that the scheme works all right, because otherwise the majority would not accept the minority rule.

Under present circumstances, "democracy" is one of the means used to deceive the workers, is part of the anti-democratic reality, and the strength of this and other means to the same end is the more remarkable since the material means of power largely have to be put in the hands of the underlying class. Even the ultimate power of militarism is in the actual control of the workers; they only could overcome the mental and moral obstacles raised by their masters.

Without going into details of the schemes of bourgeois democratic government and the multitude of ways to accomplish its anti-democratic aims, it may be worth while to call attention to the fact that parliamentarism adapts itself to the most brutal forms of autocracy. Even Germany had a parliament elected by general suffrage, a general suffrage more "democratic" than that of the United States. But while the Reichstag is allowed to talk to a certain extent, the bureaucracy acts, and is, moreover, ready to stop this talking machine any moment it threatens to become a nuisance. Another and most instructive example of a bourgeois democratic system serving Capitalism is right at hand and it is unnecessary to analyze its methods in detail. Direct corruption and speculation on personal material

interests no doubt often play a role; but by far more important are the mental methods to fool and enslave the worker. Therefore "class consciousness" has to develop so that the material means of power already in the hands of the workers can be used to overcome the class-rule of the exploiters.

This Social revolution, however, is not a matter of material and mental power. While it is perfectly clear that only a large number of the exploited masses with definite and well defined purposes can bring the change, there is no necessity that this should be a majority of the suppressed class. In fact a social revolution may turn out and has so far always turned out to be a new class rule of another minority. The hope for democracy under Socialism lies not in the Social Revolution as such, but in the fact that the victory of the workers will do away with every form of class rule. During the period of the Social Revolution the two classes continue to struggle and democracy can only be a weapon in this struggle, can only serve the interests of one class against the other. Bourgeois democracy will continue to enlist groups whose ultimate interests are with the proletarian revolution and the democracy of the victorious workers will be based upon the will and action of those groups among the workers that carry the revolution to success although they may form a minority even within the class of wage earners. Revolutions do not depend upon a majority but upon sufficient power to overcome the ruling class. This requires a mass of self-conscious and resolute proletarians acting in accordance with the demands of historic development, but there is no necessity, nor even a possibility, that this should be a majority from the very start. The proletarian revolution develops out of a condition in which the great mass of the exploited class is held in mental slavery and it is only natural that this mentality will first be broken in those workers whose position in the process of production makes them specially fit to see the light. The atmosphere of the social revolution itself is liable to open many eyes but at any given moment there is no logical reason whatever why the revolutionary forces should represent an absolute majority. And even when embracing a majority of the working class or even of the population the acts and decisions will not be based on democracy but on the proletarian class position as against the reactionary forces. This period has been called by Marx "the dictatorship of the proletariat," and he states: "If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled by circumstances to organize as a class, if by means of the revolution it makes itself the ruling class, and as such sweeps away by force the old conditions of existence of class antagonism and of classes generally it will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class." Not before then can democracy prevail.

The power in the hands of the Soviets without recognizing the bourgeois interests was the first demand of the Russian proletarian revolution. And the Soviets were by no means organized with the purpose of expressing the most ideal form of democracy but to give the most efficient expression of the Social Revolution. In the Soviets the factory workers are represented through their direct delegates, the soldiers who, under the special conditions of this world war, proved to be an active revolutionary force, have a strong influence, as well as the peasants who want the land and know that the bourgeoisie is not willing to give it to them.

And this Soviet has quite a different character from the old bourgeois parliaments. It is highly important to mark this difference, as a clear illustration of the fact, pointed out by Marx: "that

the victorious proletariat cannot seize the ready-made machinery of the state and use it for its own purposes." It has to build new organizations based, not on the government of persons, but upon administration of things. The Russian Soviet through its many subdivisions and committees controls the actual economic structure of society. Committees in charge of factories send their delegates to the local Soviets and so do the army corps, and the peasantry. Food distribution and the regulation of housing problems, requisitions, etc., are managed through local committees representing a block, a quarter, etc., and finally co-operating with the local Soviets.

All this is an organic structure in course of development under most difficult circumstances and far from complete or perfect, but nevertheless it functions, it has maintained itself already during one year against the solid opposition of the old bureaucracy and it becomes stronger every day. It is a unity of representative and executive functions, a combination also of industrial and territorial government. This is the great lesson and the great hope in the social revolution, all the revolutionary forces grow into one force, all the tendencies in the class struggle come into unity. There is no longer antagonism between economic and political action, all the revolutionary groups and factions in the class struggle unite against the counter-revolution and for the building of a new society. Development of actual facts and conditions solve problems quicker than debates ever could. What remains however, is the fundamental division in the class struggle: whosoever is not for the social revolution supports the counter-revolution and has to be dealt with as such.

Withdraw from Russia!

(Continued from Page 8)

alized, now that they see the vision of their aspirations about to become the reality of a new society, they are asked to acclaim alien troops who represent forces that wish to crush their revolution and annihilate all their achievements and aspirations.

The Soviet Republic has endured during more than thirteen months of internal counter-revolution and external imperialistic pressure. Every attempt to destroy it from within has met with disastrous failure.

The Soviet Republic has endured because it expresses the Revolution, organizes the endeavors of the masses for self-government and liberation, courageously and sincerely establishes the conquest of the Revolution.

It is this proletarian Republic that the Allies threaten to overwhelm.

International Capitalism and Imperialism are united against the Republic of the proletarian Revolution. As the governments of France and Germany united to crush the Paris commune, so international Imperialism is now uniting to crush the first proletarian revolution in Russia.

The International Revolution

(Continued from Page 5)

this force will steadily rise to power and will even become more terrible than the Spanish influenza.

The seriousness of the situation must be apparent to every worker who knows what he is aiming at and he must make the masses see it, too. The mass of workers and peasants is mature enough to be allowed to know the whole truth. The danger is great, but we must, and shall overcome it, and for this purpose we must develop and solidify the Red Army without halting. We must make it ten times as strong and large as it is. Our forces must grow with every day, and this constant growth will give us the guarantee, as before, that international Socialism will be the victor.

[Lenin's speech was greeted with tremendous enthusiasm, and a resolution was passed embodying his recommendations.]

The Bolshevik will catch you if you don't watch out

By Julia Hill

UNDER the present Capitalist system of society it seems that fear is the predominant factor in keeping people "good." Always some bogey, some horrible example, is being paraded before the public eye. No matter what the object "the powers that be" have in mind, the people are never appealed to because of the inherent virtue of the objective itself. The fearful consequence accruing if any other course is pursued forms the chief line of argument, the horrible alternative is always stressed.

The populace becomes restive under conditions as they are, some upheaval stirs the sluggish mass into inquiry, a bogey is immediately produced and the mind is terrified with *may be* into forgetting what *is*, in the same manner as an ignorant parent forces a child into obedience, by scaring it with tales of the appearance of a bogey-man consequent upon disobedience. This method of conducting society is based on fear and ignorance. The fear of the capitalists as to what would be the result of an inquiry into present day conditions by those who suffer under these conditions, and ignorance as to the actual result of such an inquiry, on the one hand; the fear of the masses of the appearance of the bogey and the ignorance that allows the existence of such a bogey to go unchallenged, on the other.

Capitalism's hirelings so far understand their masters' methods as to know that bogeys are necessary, and know the psychology of the masses sufficiently to understand that the bogeys must change from time to time, consequently they are ever on the lookout for anything that can be dressed in bogey clothes. Thus the French Revolution became the Reign of Terror and the restive masses all over the world were for a long time awed into submission with stories of its horror. But people are now becoming convinced the French Revolution was not the terrible orgy of blood it has been depicted, they are beginning to trace its beneficial effects upon the world at large, to see that what bloodshed actually did take place was a tiny rivulet compared to the sea of blood that accompanied the regime of the French aristocracy.

Accordingly Capitalism has discovered that the French Revolution, in its bourgeois aspects at least, was a glorious thing, its slogans are now the acme of bourgeois ideology. The thinking workers have progressed beyond the reforms of the French Revolution, are turning their attention to other things, so a new bogey must be found. And where would it suit Capitalism better to find this bogey than in these new ideas of the workers?

So the Bolshevik becomes the modern bogey. The Bolshevik hold the key to the solution of the world's problem, once the workers grasp the import of their doctrines Capitalism is lost. Therefore the workers must not turn a sympathetic ear to their words and the best way to keep the workers deaf is to create, out of this new evangel, a bogey—thus killing two birds with the one stone: terrorizing the people into submission with the instrument of their own salvation.

It is obviously impossible to terrorize people with something with which they are familiar. It is the unknown that is dreadful, that "puzzles the will and makes us rather cherish ills we have than fly to those we know not of." Consequently the bogey must be created out of the unknown. Socialism for a time became the prospective bogey—free love, breaking up the home, the idle dividing up with the industrious—but Socialism became more or less familiar to the average man, he became accustomed to the sound of the word, at least, and he knew that some of his own neighbors had embraced its tenets, thus it lost some of its most spectacular terrors.

When the Social Revolution became a fact in Russia and, as the struggle developed, it was found that a section of the Socialists, those who insisted in applying the full measures of Socialist principles to the problems confronting them, were called in the Russian language, Bolsheviks, the new bogey was found. Nobody seemed to know who or what the Bolshevik were. It was a chance in a lifetime and the news-

papers, the spokesmen of Capitalism, seized upon it with avidity.

The Bolshevik became, over night almost, fiends incarnate. Tales began to filter through the columns of the press of their excesses. Every crime in the calendar was charged to their account. As a matter of course they became German agents in the Allied countries, and Allied agents in the Central European states. Vague accounts of slaughter fests in the streets of the Russian cities became an every day occurrence. Discriptions of the appearance and manner of these Bolshevik were so vivid that the average newspaper reader got a confused idea of a Bolshevik as an animal, somewhat resembling a man, with a large bushy beard, wild uncombed hair, uncouth ways of speech, small beady eyes and an unquenchable thirst for the blood of a very harmless and good section of the Russian people known as the Bourgeoisie.

Russian nobility were slaughtered out of hand by these wild people, but nobody could work up a very righteous rage about the death of the Czar or the members of his court, unless the details of the execution were particularly horrible. So the newspapers killed the Czar about once a week, each time giving him a different form of death. First he was hanged, most people seemed to agree that he could scarcely have expected to escape anything else, then he was shot without a trial on a very cold and stormy morning just before daybreak, then he was slowly done to death by starvation, then trampled by the mob, then he was tortured in prison, then given a slow and very painful poison and finally he was boiled in oil to the accompaniment of delighted yells from a mob of Bolsheviks.

The Czar, however, had few friends in the world, even amongst the most tender-hearted, so the newspapers left him alone and turned their attention to the Bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie were described as that section of the population who were always engaged in performing useful work, except while they were bathing or putting on clean collars. Sob stories about the beauty of their homes, the cleanliness of their babies, the gentleness of their voices, their spotless linen and the culture and refinement of their womenfolk, filled the pages of the press. Then one morning a horrified world learned that the Bolshevik had decided to massacre the Bourgeoisie; everyone with a white collar, a beautiful home, a clean baby or a refined look was to be immediately done to death without trial.

Now whenever the news from Russia is scanty an account of a massacre of the bourgeoisie by the Bolshevik is published with full details.

But who are these Bolshevik and what is Bolshevism if we take away the bogey clothes?

The Bolshevik are revolutionary Socialists and Bolshevism is Socialist theories and principles translated into action. Bolshevism is not peculiar to Russia nor is it peculiarly Russian. It is simply Socialism applied to Russian conditions. The Bolshevik are the people; the workers, the farmers and the soldiers. They are that section of the Russians who under the Czaristic regime felt the lash of the knout, the pangs of hunger, the bitter frost of winter. They are exactly the same type and class of people who form the large mass of the population of any country, the disinherited, "the large and respectable class of no property," the men and women who perform the world's work and who bear the world's miseries. The only difference between the Russian Bolshevik and the mass of the people anywhere is that the Bolshevik are class conscious, intelligent students of conditions as they exist under Capitalism and as they will exist under Socialism.

The Bolshevik are the architects of the new structure of society, the seers and heralds of the new age. Bolshevism is the instrument of the workers in abolishing the old order and establishing the new. Its tactics, in the work of abolition, follow the scientific lines laid down by those who foresaw the breakdown of

the present system of society, and its methods, in the work of building the new society, follow the same scientific lines, augmented by the knowledge gained through the actual operation of destroying the old structure of society.

As opposed to the section of the Russian people who are called Mensheviks, Social Revolutionists and a variety of other names, the Bolsheviks, refuse to be content with simply repairing the old system of society to temporarily suit the needs of the moment, but insist on rebuilding the whole structure on a new foundation. In the course of the actual work of abolishing the old system it developed that a minority of the Socialist theorists became afraid of the success of their own principles, wanted to call a halt and endeavor to affect a compromise between the old and the new. The Bolshevik took the stand that only by thoroughgoing methods could the new structure be made to withstand the storms and refused to compromise on any fundamental principle. They maintained that the old system of society must be eradicated root and branch, that the two systems could not exist together but that one or the other must finally prevail, and they threw themselves uncompromisingly on the side of the new society.

They declare that the continuation of various classes in society works detriment to the world as a whole and they propose to do away with classes by establishing one class in society and one only—the working class—to the end that every person in society must contribute to the maintenance of Society.

The Bolshevik recognize that, in order to carry out this program, it is necessary that the people of all countries should cooperate, that the world instead of being divided into various and antagonistic groups must become one organic whole, having only one fundamental interest: the maintenance and well-being of society as a whole.

These ideas necessarily meet with opposition from the class which profits from the present system—the Capitalistic class; and this opposition must, in its very nature, also be uncompromising because it recognizes that either society must be constituted among the lines laid down by the Bolsheviks, or it must continue along the present lines—the existence of one group by the exploitation of the rest. This opposition takes the form of open war in Russia, and the creation of the Bolshevik bogey elsewhere. Capitalism recognizes that where Bolshevism is strong it must be fought and exterminated by means of killing sufficient of its advocates, and that, where it has not yet captured the minds of the masses it must be prevented from doing so by preventing its principles and practices into something that will repel the majority of the workers. Only by preventing the spread of Bolshevism can Capitalism save itself from destruction, because under the present system, the few dominate the many, and once the masses realize this, Capitalism will vanish like an evil dream.

So the bogey is paraded before the public eye in all its trappings, and the people are warned: "The Bolshevik will get you if you don't watch out."

The Berlin workers by their action in suspending the issues of the newspapers show that if they can't have the truth they are at least determined that they shall have no lies.

Samuel Gompers is very much annoyed that although he has taken a decided stand against the formation of a Labor Party the movement is getting extensive support, but he should take consolation from the fact that though the Kaiser was fired he has not even been asked to resign his job—yet.

"Mr. Bonar Law gives advice to Labor," runs a headline, but then nobody ever takes advice.

We wonder did Senators Sherman and Knox ever hear of an old copy-book line beginning with something about the cat being away?

Withdraw from Russia!

II

The Pretexts for Intervention

THE news coming out of Russia since armed intervention was initiated parallels, in a measure, the news from Belgium during the early days of the war, when Germany invaded that nation, disavowing interference in the internal affairs of the Belgian people—and imposing an alien dominion upon the people.

The invasion of a peaceful nation against the protest of its government, *de jure* or *de facto*, is a violation of the laws of nations, and of all the avowed purposes of the Allies. It is an expression, fundamentally, of Imperialism and militarism. It is the crime of imposing an alien will upon the peoples by means of the bayonet. Is this what the Allies mean by the freedom of nations and the inviolability of international law?

The immediate objective of intervention, that the Czech-Slovaks might act as the centre for the counter-revolutionary overthrow of the Soviet Government, or, in the words of Lloyd-George, that intervention might create "a centre for the elements opposed to Bolshevism," has collapsed miserably and completely. The theory was that the Russian people were helpless under the domination of a few unscrupulous individuals, that the Soviet Government was not representative of the masses. Intervene, was the theory of intervention, and the Russian people will itself sweep aside the Soviet autocracy. But more than five months have passed since intervention was initiated, and the Soviets are still supreme. More than five months have passed, and the counter-revolution from within has not materialized, and its petty, isolated expressions have been easily crushed. More than five months have passed, months of enormous pressure, and it has been proven that the strength of the Soviets is the strength of the revolutionary masses. What now? Shall one million, shall two million, American, British, and Japanese troops march against the Russian people? Shall the Soviet Republic be crushed by the overwhelming might of alien military power?

All that this preliminary intervention accomplished was to multiply the agony of the Russian people. The Czech-Slovaks disorganized the food supply of the country, increasing starvation, interfering with industrial and social reconstruction. The Allies are blockading Russia, increasing starvation. And one of the purposes of intervention was to relieve the starvation of the Russian people!

We are familiar in this country with the hypocritical methods used by the sinister interests of Imperialism to force intervention in a country in which they have brutal purposes to promote. When American interests intrigued for intervention in Mexico, the press teemed with heart-rending stories about "mass starvation" in Mexico; enough crocodile tears were shed to convince the sentimental—and the gullible. But after intervention became impossible, the American press did not any longer concern itself with "mass starvation" in Mexico. . . . But if Russia is starving—why not ship food? Is the proper means of relieving starvation bread or bullets?

The Russian people do not beg for food, they do not ask for charity—that is a bourgeois characteristic: the bourgeois is either a bully or a beggar.

The Russian people do not want charity. They want all alien troops to leave Russia, so that they can proceed in their own way with the tasks of reconstruction. They want the blockade of Russia ended, a blockade which gives the lie direct to all claims of being interested in relieving starvation in Russia; they want free and equal access to the markets of the world. The Russian people do not plead—they demand; they demand that the international proletariat shall insist upon justice for Russia. . . .

"We must restore Russia!" clamor the hypocritical representatives of Imperialism, who also want to restore Russia—in what way and for whom? Is Russia to be restored by intensifying her disorganization through invasion, preventing the recovery of the country and multiplying the factors making for starvation? Is Russia to be restored through a "Peace

of Warsaw," imposed by means of crushing the revolutionary masses with alien bayonets? Is Russia to be restored to the imperialistic bourgeoisie and the Czarist bloc? Is Russia to be restored by crushing Socialism. These are the inevitable consequences of successful intervention: the revolutionary masses are resisting intervention and invasion to the death.

The imperialistic press prints all sorts of lying stories about terrorism in Russia. But did this press ever propose intervention in Russia against the terrorism of Czarism? This is a stupid pretext. Capitalism itself is terrorism; a never-ceasing terror. Capitalist industry is a terror. Capitalist government is a terror. Capitalism is an organized terror against the proletariat. It is because revolutionary Russia struggles to end this bourgeois terror and that bourgeois hirelings everywhere insist upon the crushing of the Soviet Republic—to end terrorism! This end of "terrorism" in Russia would mean the initiation of a new international terror against the proletariat, against civilization.

Is the use of troops and police during strikes not terror? Was the massacre of women and children at Ludlow not terror? This is terrorism against the proletariat and civilization; what terrorism there is in Russia is for the proletariat and civilization.

Bourgeois morality admits the necessity of war under certain conditions; and war is a giant, organized terrorism. Was the recent war a pink-tea affair, with its tens of millions dead and maimed? So be it; revolution is a form of war—a civil war. Every revolution flares up into civil war—the French Revolution, the American Revolution, the Russian and the German Revolution. Terrorism was used in all these revolutions; and it was justified. Civil war rages in Russia; in our own civil war, was the fight waged with bon-bons and sprays of perfume? Progress proceeds in the shadow of the valley of death.

Complaints of terrorism in Russia are sheer hypocrisy. There is terrorism in Russia, the necessary terrorism of every revolution; but it is vilely exaggerated by the imperialistic press: there is no need for much terrorism in Russia since the masses of the people are for the Soviet Republic and the counter-revolution within has been dispersed.

But—the Bolsheviks are pro-Germans! Are they? Was their revolutionary agitation against the Kaiserism, their co-operation with revolutionary Socialism in Germany, "pro-German"?

This argument never had a shred of validity; that is now apparent; but alien troops are still in Archangel and Vladivostok! . . .

Let us consider the "pro-German" argument.

The usual form of this argument was that the Bolsheviks, Lenin and Trotsky, were agents of German Imperialism. This was obviously silly; not even the forged documents offered as "evidence" by the Creel Committee could make one believe this stupid fairy-tale.

More appropriate was the argument that the Brest-Litovsk treaty had to be revised. But this revision has now been accomplished by military disaster—and the proletarian revolution in Germany; but—alien troops are still in Archangel and Vladivostok!

The necessity for the revision of the Brest-Litovsk treaty was indisputable; but the problem was: *who* shall do the revising, and in the interests of *whom*? Should this revision be accomplished by crushing the Soviets and the Revolution, the revision would be more infamous and disastrous than the original treaty itself. It would have been an imperialistic revision, promoting international Imperialism.

Revolutionary Russia realized the enormity of the Brest-Litovsk peace, and used all its energy to bring about its revision in the only Socialist way—by developing the proletarian revolution in Germany. In September the Bolshevik Zinoviev, speaking in Petrograd, said: Don't worry about the supplementary clauses in the Brest treaty; Comrade Lenin signs

them without even reading the text; they do not matter: the German revolution will come and destroy the imperialistic plans of Germany.

The Revolution did come; German Imperialism is dead. But alien troops are still in Archangel and Vladivostok! . . .

Another argument made in favor of intervention was that the eastern front should be restored. In September, Secretary of State Lansing announced that it was not America's intention to restore the eastern front; but American troops stayed in Vladivostok. Now there is no necessity of restoring the eastern front; but alien troops are still in Archangel and Vladivostok!

Let us consider this "restoration of the eastern front," that Russia should be dragged back into the war. Let us dismiss the propriety, the decency and justice, of forcing a nation into war against its will; this procedure was a crime only when perpetrated by Imperial Germany. There is a much more convincing answer. These four and a half years of war have proven that war today is largely a problem of productive capacity. The military machine, depends absolutely upon a properly functioning industrial machine behind the front. Industry determines the capacity of a nation to fight; industrial collapse inevitably means military collapse. Now, what was the situation in Russia? Industrial disintegration was general, a disintegration produced by the regime of the Czar and completed by the bourgeois-"Socialist" regime of Kerensky. The heritage of the Soviet Republic was industrial chaos. Under these conditions, to have continued the war would have been sheer suicide, the end of the Revolution. Russia could resume the military war against Germany, either an imperialistic or a revolutionary war, only after industry had been restored. The political, the social, the military problems of Russia all resolve into one central problem—the restoration of normal conditions of production, the development of industrial power out of which alone rises military power.

Moreover, Soviet Russia was not thinking in terms of war, but in terms of the class war, of the revolutionary war. Soviet Russia's policy was determined by the necessity of arousing the proletarian revolution in Germany, as a preliminary to the proletarian revolution in all Europe. In urging ratification of the Brest treaty, Lenin argued: This is an infamous peace against the Revolution, but it will fail, precisely as the more onerous Tilsit treaty of Napoleon failed to crush Prussia; then only a few bourgeois intellectuals made history; now the masses are in motion, and history moves with the speed of a locomotive; if we try simultaneously to carry on a war against our own Imperialism and foreign Imperialism, we shall lose both wars: Capitalism and reaction will come back to power in Russia, and the revolution in Germany will be postponed indefinitely, but if we, through peace, however onerous, can concentrate on the inner problems of our Revolution, and crush forever Russian Imperialism and the counter-revolution, then later will inevitably come our victory against international Imperialism, our peace will not end the war or insure German victory; the war will flare up more intense and violent than ever; the economic and social crisis will be feverishly accelerated, will inevitably produce the Revolution—and then Soviet Russia will come into her own!

It was a sober analysis of the facts, a brilliant formulation of revolutionary Socialist tactics. Revolutionary Russia did conquer! . . . When the revolution started in Germany, Soviet Russia offered the German proletariat help—and a million troops! . . .

The journalistic hirelings of Imperialism pretend surprise that the Russian people are resisting the counter-revolutionary invaders. Apparently, the Russian workers and peasants should without a protest and without resistance allow their own revolution to be crushed, a revolution that they have accomplished by means of unparalleled struggles, in blood and tears and agony. And now that their hopes are being re-

(Continued on Page 6)